



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,992	12/02/2003	Kenichi Kuba	1300-000009	5211

27572 7590 08/17/2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 828  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

DICHT, RACHEL S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2853

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/725,992

Applicant(s)

KUBA ET AL.

Examiner

Rachel Dicht

Art Unit

2853

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/26/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of a printing unit comprising a printing area-like portion with a plurality of ink supply members, a plurality of detecting systems, and a control system to control the plurality of ink supply members in the reply filed on 12 July 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the printing unit of claim 1 is recited as the second printing unit of the manufacturing line of claim 14. This is not found persuasive because claim 14 is dependent on a manufacturing line for manufacturing an organic EL display not including a printing unit.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Arrow L not located in Fig. 2 (refer to page 6 line 24).

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2853

4. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmid (US Pat. No. 6,427,591).

In regard to:

Claim 1:

Schmid teaches a printing unit comprising: at least one printing area or printing area-like portion, a plurality of ink supply members (4, Fig. 1) for supplying inks different, in kinds, from each other to the printing area-like portion; a plurality of detecting systems, each detecting an amount of the corresponding ink accumulated on the printing area or printing area-like portion (refer to column 7 lines 1-3); and a control system for controlling the plurality of ink supply members to regulate an amount of ink supplied by each of the plurality of ink supply members so as to bring the amount of the corresponding ink accumulated into agreement with a predetermined value established for the ink detected (refer to column 6 lines 37-42).

Claim 3:

Schmid teaches a printing unit wherein the printing area or area-like portion is a part of an offset gravure printing cylinder immediately upstream a doctor blade wiping an excess in off the offset gravure printing cylinder (refer to column 1 line 13-24).

Claim 7:

Schmid teaches a printing unit wherein each of the plurality of ink supply members (4, Fig. 1) includes an ink container (refer to column 1 lines 13-18), a pump to deliver the ink out of the container (refer to column 6 lines 16-18), and a nozzle to eject the ink to the printing area or printing area-like portion (refer to column 6 lines 14-16).

Claim 8:

Schmid teaches the printing unit wherein each of the plurality of detecting systems includes a displacement sensor for detecting a surface portion of the accumulated ink (refer to column 7 lines 1-3).

Claim 9:

Schmid teaches the printing unit wherein the control system controls a flow rate of the ink delivered from the pump of each of the plurality of ink supply members to the nozzle so that the surface position of the ink is brought into agreement with a predetermined level (refer to column 6 lines 37-42).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2853

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmid (US Pat. No. 6,427,591) in view of Johnson (US Pat. No. 5,678,483).

The device of Schmid DIFFERS from claim 2 in that it fails to teach a printing unit wherein the printing area or printing area-like portion is a part of a gravure printing cylinder immediately upstream a doctor blade wiping an excess ink off the gravure printing cylinder.

However, Johnson teaches a printing unit wherein the printing area or printing area-like portion is a part of a gravure printing cylinder immediately upstream a doctor blade (32, Fig. 5) wiping an excess ink off the gravure printing cylinder (refer to column 6 lines 7-8).

Therefore, it would be would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Schmid to have the printing area-like portion as part of a gravure printing cylinder with a doctor blade as taught by Johnson for the purpose of surface uniformity.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmid (US Pat. No. 6,427,591) in view of Capdeboscq (US Pat. No. 6,029,573).

The device of Schmid DIFFERS from claim 4 in that it fails to teach a printing unit wherein the printing area or area-like portion is a part of an anilox roller of flexo printing immediately upstream a doctor blade wiping an excess ink off the anilox roller.

However, Capdeboscq teaches a printing unit wherein the printing area or area-like portion is a part of an anilox roller of flexo printing immediately upstream a doctor blade wiping excess ink off the anilox roller (refer to Summary of the Invention, paragraph 15 and 16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Schmid to include a printing area as part of an anilox roller as taught by Capdeboscq for the purpose of printing large surfaces.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmid (US Pat. No. 6,427,591) in view of Kuehnle (US Pat. No. 5,343,234).

The device of Schmid DIFFERS from claim 5 in that it fails to teach a printing unit wherein the printing area or printing area-like portion is an ink roller of offset printing.

However, Kuehnle teaches a printing unit wherein the printing area or printing area-like portion is an ink roller of offset printing (refer to column 1 line 51-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Schmid to include an ink roller of offset printing as taught by Kuehnle for the purpose of having a less complex and quicker machine.

9. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmid (US Pat. No. 6,427,591) in view of Dubuit (US Pat. No. 6,397,740).

The device of Schmid DIFFERS from claim 7 in that it fails to teach a printing unit wherein the printing area or printing area-like portion is a part of a screen printing plate immediately upstream a squeegee wiping an excess ink off the screen printing plate.

However, Dubuit teaches a printing unit wherein the printing area or printing area-like portion is a part of a screen printing plate immediately upstream a squeegee wiping an excess ink off the screen printing plate (refer to Detailed Description of Art, Paragraph 6).



Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Schmid for the purpose of having a printing area is part of a screen printing plate as taught by Dubuit for the purpose of having a high throughput.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel Dicht whose telephone number is 571-272-8544. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am - 3:30 pm Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Meier can be reached on 571-272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RSD



August 8, 2005



MANISH S. SHAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER